

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION SEVEN

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

DAVID LEE SCOTT,

Defendant and Appellant.

B171104

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. NA017034)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County.
Margaret M. Hay, Judge. Affirmed.

David Lee Scott, in pro. per.; and Gregory L. Cannon, under appointment
by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

David Lee Scott appeals from the October 8, 2003 order denying his petition for a writ of *error coram nobis* filed in propria persona. In his petition filed in superior court October 6, 2003, appellant sought to vacate the judgment and set aside his conviction for second degree murder and attempted murder in the case entitled *People v. David Lee Scott*, Los Angeles County Superior Court case No. NA017034.

The superior court summarily denied the petition on the ground that a writ of *error coram nobis* does not lie in the trial court after the conviction has been affirmed on appeal (Pen. Code, § 1265, subd. (a).) We note appellant previously appealed from the judgment in Los Angeles Superior Court case No. NA017034, which this Court affirmed in *People v. David Lee Scott*, B085121. The California Supreme Court denied review in 1995 (S045465).

We appointed counsel to represent him on appeal.

After examination of the record, counsel filed an “Opening Brief” in which no issues were raised. On April 5, 2004, we advised appellant that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues that he wished us to consider.

Appellant personally filed a response on April 19, 2004, in which he made claims he previously asserted in his petition for writ of *error coram nobis*.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that appellant’s attorney has fully complied with the responsibilities of counsel and that no arguable issues exist. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 277-284; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

WOODS, J.

We concur:

JOHNSON, Acting P. J.

ZELON, J.